

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 445

September 19, 1995, 6:58 p.m.
Page S-13820 Temp. Record

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS/Elimination of Mink Export Subsidies

SUBJECT: Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996 . . . H.R. 1976. Cochran motion to table the Kerry amendment No. 2695.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE FAILED, 18-78

SYNOPSIS: As reported, H.R. 1976, the Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996, will provide \$63.78 billion in new budget authority, 80 percent of which will be for mandatory spending programs, and 63 percent of which will be for food welfare programs.

The Kerry amendment would prohibit using funds from this Act to provide assistance through the Market Promotion Program to the United States Mink Export Development Council or any mink industry trade association.

During debate, Senator Cochran moved to table the Kerry amendment. A motion to table is not debatable; however, some debate preceded the making of the motion. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

NOTE: Following the vote, the Kerry amendment was agreed to by voice vote.

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

The Kerry amendment is not about saving money. It would leave the MPP budget untouched. If mink exporters were denied marketing assistance, that assistance would just be given to exporters of other products. As we argued on the earlier vote on the MPP, that program does not exist to benefit anyone except American producers. Our colleagues have noted that two large companies have received most of the mink export dollars. However, those companies buy from American mink producers located in 28 States. The industry had been declining, but last year it increased its exports by \$100 million. One of the main reasons for that increase is that falling trade barriers have made it possible to move into markets that were formerly closed. The MPP has been working to promote mink exports. Like for any other product, that effort has not been made to benefit large exporting countries, nor has it been made

(See other side)

YEAS (18)		NAYS (78)				NOT VOTING (4)	
Republicans (15 or 29%)	Democrats (3 or 7%)	Republicans (36 or 71%)		Democrats (42 or 93%)		Republicans (3)	Democrats (1)
Ashcroft	Baucus	Abraham	Kyl	Akaka	Inouye	Frist- ²	Johnston- ²
Bennett	Feingold	Brown	Lott	Biden	Kennedy	Hatfield- ^{3AY}	
Bond	Kohl	Chafee	Lugar	Bingaman	Kerrey	Simpson- ²	
Burns		Coats	Mack	Boxer	Kerry		
Campbell		Cohen	McCain	Bradley	Lautenberg		
Cochran		Coverdell	McConnell	Breaux	Leahy		
Craig		D'Amato	Murkowski	Bryan	Levin		
Domenici		DeWine	Nickles	Bumpers	Lieberman		
Gorton		Dole	Roth	Byrd	Mikulski		
Grassley		Faircloth	Santorum	Conrad	Moseley-Braun		
Hatch		Gramm	Shelby	Daschle	Moynihan		
Kempthorne		Grams	Smith	Dodd	Murray		
Packwood		Gregg	Snowe	Dorgan	Nunn		
Pressler		Helms	Stevens	Exon	Pell		
Specter		Hutchison	Thomas	Feinstein	Pryor		
		Inhofe	Thompson	Ford	Reid		
		Jeffords	Thurmond	Glenn	Robb		
		Kassebaum	Warner	Graham	Rockefeller		
				Harkin	Sarbanes		
				Heflin	Simon		
				Hollings	Wellstone		

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Buisiness
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

to benefit foreign consumers, though both of course benefit. Instead, it has been for the benefit of American producers. Most Senators voted yesterday to continue the MPP. We hope today that they do not vote that they think that the MPP is a good idea for every American product except mink.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

Every year since 1989 the United States has spent about \$2 million a year through the Market Promotion Program to promote foreign fashion shows of mink. The mink industry is profitable--it does not need these subsidies. Two very large companies in particular, Hudson Bay's North American Fur and American Legends, have benefitted. These companies sell billions of dollars of merchandise per year--they do not need \$2 million bonuses from the Federal Government. Even if the United States Government were flush with cash this expenditure would be a waste of money. As we are all painfully aware, though, the United States has a \$5 trillion debt and runs huge annual deficits, and deep cuts are being made in very meritorious programs in an effort to end those deficits and reduce that debt. Giving these facts, this expenditure is obscene. Making matters even worse, from a fiscal standpoint, is that as subsidies have gradually increased, mink exports have declined by one-third. In other words, the program is not working. In a way, though, we are very pleased by this result. The American Society for the Prevention to Cruelty to Animals has informed us that the commercial mink industry is guilty of extreme cruelty. We do not want to see this industry thrive. Some Senators may favor using taxpayer funds to pay for profitable, animal-abusing companies' mink fashion shows in Europe and Asia. We do not, and therefore oppose the motion to table the Kerry amendment.